

## ORIGINAL

RECEIVED

## BEFORE THE ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION Arizona Corporation Commission 2007 DEC 19 P 1: 32

WILLIAM A. MUNDELL Chairman

JIM IRVIN

3

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

Commissioner

MARC SPITZER
Commissioner

DOCKETED

DEC 1 9 2002

AZ CORP COMMISSION DOCUMENT CONTROL

DOCKETED BY

CAR

IN THE MATTER OF QWEST COMMUNICATIONS INTERNATIONAL INC.'S, QWEST SERVICES CORPORATION'S, AND QWEST CORPORATION'S NOTICE OF SALE, REQUEST FOR WAIVER, OR APPLICATION FOR APPROVAL OF THE SALE OF THE ARIZONA OPERATIONS OF DEX, INC.

DOCKET NO. T-01051B-02-0666

STAFF'S REPLY TO QWEST'S RESPONSE REGARDING A PROCEDURAL SCHEDULE IN THIS CASE

On December 4, 2002, Staff requested a Procedural Order to establish a procedural schedule for the filing of testimony and an evidentiary hearing in this case. Qwest Corporation ("Qwest" or "Company") filed a Response on December 17, 2002 opposing Staff's proposed schedule. In lieu of Staff's proposed schedule, the Company proposed its own abbreviated schedule to address the issues in this case. Staff files this Reply to the Company's Response.

The Company argues that R14-2-803(A) of the Commission's Affiliated Interest rules contemplate that any action by Staff relating to utility or affiliate reorganizations shall occur within 120 days of notification. Staff believes that the Company has improperly construed what is merely a mandatory 120 day notice requirement under the rules, into a requirement which would obligate the Staff and/or Commission to act on the proposed transaction within 120 days. Staff does not believe that the Company's interpretation of R14-2-803(A) is reasonable or supportable. In addition, Qwest's arguments notwithstanding, the Commission always has the right to suspend or waive any deadlines contained in its own rules, as necessary in order to complete its review of the issues presented.

Qwest also argues that Staff's proposed schedule is unreasonable since it has not yet been determined whether the Commission even has jurisdiction to "delay" the sale at all. First, Staff's

28

proposed schedule would not "delay" the sale since the Rodney Sale (of which Arizona is a part) is scheduled to close in mid-December, 2003 and another state has scheduled regulatory proceedings well into next summer to review the Rodney Sale. Second, Staff's request for a Procedural Order and an evidentiary hearing in this case is predicated on Staff's belief and opinion that the Commission does have jurisdiction over the transfer of Qwest Dex to Dex Holdings, LLC. To the extent the Company desires to make legal arguments to the contrary, it would certainly be entitled to make those arguments to the Hearing Division.

Third, Qwest has proposed a schedule which generally coincides with dates adopted by the Utah Commission for review of this transaction. Staff's proposed schedule coincides more closely with the dates adopted by the Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission ("WUTC") for review. The WUTC is scheduled to hold hearings on Qwest's application on May 19-23, 2003. Staff's proposed hearing dates are only one month later than the WUTC's hearings.

Qwest also argues that Staff is using the same consultant that was hired by parties in Utah and Washington, and therefore, since Staff's consultant has access to the discovery already done in Utah and Washington, the Arizona Staff should be able to conduct its review on a more expedited basis. While this may be true to an extent, Staff would point out that there are issues that are likely to arise in Arizona that are different than the other states. Qwest has already filed its testimony in the Utah proceeding, but has yet to file any testimony in Washington or Arizona that would address the regulatory framework or the issues arising from the Application in Arizona. In addition, given the long term implications of the transfer, Staff wants to ensure that it has adequate time to conduct a thorough review, including all potential implications for

• •

•••

. • • •

Arizona ratepayers in the future.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED this day of December, 2002.

10

11

12

13

14 15

16

17

18

19 20

21

22

24

23

25 26

27

28

Christopher C. Kempley, Chief Counsel

Maureen A. Scott, Attorney

Legal Division

**Arizona Corporation Commission** 1200 West Washington Street Phoenix, Arizona 85007

Telephone: (602) 542-3402 Facsimile: (602) 542-4870

ORIGINAL and Fifteen (15) copies Of the foregoing hand-delivered this day of December, 2002, to:

Arizona Corporation Commission Docket Control 1200 West Washington Street Phoenix, Arizona 85007

COPY of the Foregoing hand-delivered this / day of December, 2002, to:

Lyn Farmer, Chief Administrative Law Judge Arizona Corporation Commission Hearing Division

1200 West Washington Phoenix, Arizona 85007

Chris Kempley, Chief Counsel Maureen Scott, Counsel **Arizona Corporation Commission** Legal Division 1200 West Washington Phoenix, Arizona 85007

Ernest G. Johnson Director, Utilities Division Arizona Corporation Commission 1200 West Washington Phoenix, Arizona 85007

Timothy Berg, Esq. Theresa Dwyer Fennemore Craig 3003 N. Central Avenue, Suite 2600 Phoenix, AZ 85012

Peter Q. Nyce, JR. Regulator Law Office US Army Litigation Center 901 N. Stuart Street, Suite 713 Arlington, VA 22203-1837

Mark Brown, Esq. **Owest Corporation** 3033 North 3<sup>rd</sup> Street Phoenix, AZ 85012

	·
1 2	Mr. Richard Lee Snavely King Majoros O'Com Inc.
3	1220 L Street, NW Suite 410 Washington, DC 20005
4	Peter J. Roselli Wendy Moser
5	Sharon Berry  Qwest Corporation
6	1801 California Street Denver, CO 80202
7	Denver, CO 00202
8	
9	
10	
11	Deboras N. Ame
12	Deborah A. Amaral Assistant to Maureen A. Scott
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	

28

Majoros O'Connor & Lee,

N. America

Russell P. Rowe William C. Brittan Campbell, Bohn, Killin, Brittan & Ray, LLC 260 St. Paul Street, Suite 200 Denver, CO 80206

Scott S. Wakefield Chief Counsel Residential Utility Consumer Office 1110 West Washington, Suite 220 Phoenix, AZ 85007